Appl. No. 10/024,796
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2006

Docket No. EMC-034PUS

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments set forth above and the below remarks.

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 6 and 11 are amended herein.

Claims 6 and 11 are rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. Regarding claim 6, the Examiner stated that the term "can be" renders the claim indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 6 to remove this term and to recite "wherein state is set to indicate a new work order request initially and later changed to indicate a closed work order request."

Regarding claim 11, the Examiner stated that the terms "if" and "otherwise" render the claim indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 11 to recite "wherein updating comprises: marking the state to indicate that the work order request is closed if such tasks are performed successfully; and marking the state to indicate a failure if such tasks are not performed successfully." Thus, amended claim 11 does not contain the term "otherwise." Applicants respectfully submit that use of the term "if" in claim 11 does not render the claim indefinite. Rather, it is clear that, upon the occurrence of such tasks being performed successfully, the state is marked to indicate that the work order request is closed and, upon the occurrence of such tasks not being performed successfully, the state is marked to indicate a failure.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been overcome and thus, should be removed.

Claims 1-22 were rejected as being anticipated by Raja (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0049903). Regarding independent claims 1, 21, and 22, Applicants respectfully submit that Raja neither describes nor suggests at least "providing a customer with a list of types of work order requests based on a permission level associated with the customer, the

Appl. No. 10/024,796
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2006

Docket No. EMC-034PUS

work order requests comprising requests to manage storage configuration ... creating a database object based on the work order request... ." With the claimed arrangement, and as described in the Summary section of the subject application, customers and service providers can track work order requests generated by the customer. Also, the workflow database can be queried either manually or by an automation to find new requests and perform the task associated with the work order request.

Raja is directed to a method and system for contract based finance and time management. (see Raja Abstract) The Raja system establishes contract and project guidelines, gathers expense data, gathers time data, and analyzes the expense and time data within contract and project guidelines, and routes expense data and routes time data for managerial approval and financial processing. (see Raja paragraph 0005).

The Examiner appears to liken the claimed customer with an employee or resource in Raja and the claimed work order requests with a Raja timesheet. (see Page 3 of the March 22, 2006 Office Action referencing "(Fig. 2, 282, Raja)"). However, a timesheet is simply a mechanism for tracking time spent on a particular project or task; whereas a work order request is a request for a particular task to be performed.

Furthermore, the claimed "work order requests" cannot fairly be read on the Raja timesheets since the claim requires the work order requests to comprise "requests to manage storage configuration." In this regard, the Examiner directs Applicant's attention to paragraph 0041 of Raja. However, paragraph 0041 simply describes that the invention relates to apparatus for performing described operations and such apparatus can be specially constructed apparatus or can be a general purpose computer activated by a computer program that may be stored in a computer readable storage medium. This is not a teaching of work order requests comprising requests to manage storage configuration, as claimed.

Raja also does not describe or suggest providing a customer with a list of types of work order requests or doing so based on a permission level associated with the customer, as claimed.

As described on page 11 of the subject application, "[T]ypes of work order requests could include, for example, 'connect storage to server', 'allocate storage to customer account', 'create a mirror', 'restore remote mirroring', 'split a business continuance volume (BCV)', and so forth." Regarding this claim feature, the Examiner directs Applicant's attention to Figure 2, element 282 of Raja. However, element 282 refers to a "Get Template Button" of a timesheet which is a mechanism for retrieving a previously filled out template (see Raja paragraph 0110). Thus, element 282 does provide a list of types of work order requests. Furthermore, Raja does not provide a list of types of work order requests "based on a permission level associated with the customer," as claimed.

Raja also does not describe or suggest, "creating a database object based on the work order request." In this regard, the Examiner directs applicant's attention to Figure 6A and states that "wherein updating contact setup the user is creating a database object based on the work order request." Raja Figure 6A illustrates a contract setup interface for assigning administrators. Since Raja does not contemplate the claimed work order requests comprising requests to manage storage configuration, Raja also does not contemplate the claimed database object based on the work order request.

In view of the above, it is submitted that independent claims 1, 21, and 22 are patentable over Raja.

Claims 2-20 are dependent on claim 1 and thus, are believed to be allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim. Furthermore, Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-20 are further patentable over Raja. For example, Raja neither describes nor suggests "providing to the customer at least one task screen corresponding to the selected type of work order request and usable by the customer to generate the work order request" as set forth in claim 2. The Examiner directs Applicant's attention to Figure 2 in this regard. However, again, Raja does not contemplate providing a customer with a list of types of work order requests or the claimed work order requests comprising requests to manage storage configuration, for reasons described above. Thus, Raja also does not contemplate a task screen corresponding to a selected type of work order

Appl. No. 10/024,796
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2006

Docket No. EMC-034PUS

request. The Figure 2 timesheet does not appear to correspond to a selected type of work order request and thus, does not appear to provide the claimed task screen corresponding to a selected type of work order request, as claimed.

Claim 3 is also further patentable over Raja, since Raja neither describes nor suggests work order requests comprising values of parameters specific to the selected type of work order request. Again, Raja does not contemplate providing a customer with a list of types of work order requests or the claimed work order requests comprising requests to manage storage configuration, for reasons described above. Regarding claim 3, the Examiner directs Applicant's attention to paragraph 0045 of Raja. In paragraph 0045, it is described that parameters of the time and financial data management system "are determined when a client hires a company to complete a project" and may include "the price the client will pay the company for completing the project; the rate of monetary billing and the base rate; such as dollars per hour, day or week per a resource's role or task, ..." However, there is no teaching that such parameters are specific to a selected type of work order request, as claimed.

In view of the above, it is submitted that claims 1-22 are patentable over the cited reference.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney if there are any questions regarding this Amendment or this application.

Applicants do not acquiesce to any assertion made by the Examiner that is not specifically addressed herein.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500845.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _24 April 2006_

DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE, LLP

By: _Judith C. Crowley_
    Judith C. Crowley
    Reg. No. 35,091
    Attorney for Applicant(s)
    354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A
    Canton, MA 02021-2714
    Tel.: (781) 401-9988, Ext. 12
    Fax: (781) 401-9966
    jcc@dc-m.com

26121